

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 are pending in this application. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected the Claims as follows. Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,764,648 (Yamane). Claims 1-6 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,838,202 (Kosiec).

Regarding the Examiner's rejection of Claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. §112, the Examiner states that the specification does not disclose controlling a radio reception portion to operate only during a transmission burst period and controlling a transmitter portion to operate only during a reception burst period. After reviewing the specification, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is incorrect as that the specification provides sufficient support for the recitations cited by the Examiner. For example, the paragraphs beginning on page 7, line 24 and page 8, line 10 disclose the radio transmitter is disabled in a non-transmission burst period and the radio receiver portion is disabled in a non-reception burst period, respectively. Moreover, the drawings provide further support for the subject recitations. Accordingly, as the specification provides support for that which is recited in the claims, it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, of Claims 1-6 be withdrawn.

Regarding the Examiner's rejection of independent Claim 1 as being anticipated by Yamane, after reviewing the cited reference, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is

incorrect. The Examiner states that the abstract; FIG. 1; FIG. 11A, block 11p; FIG. 2; and Column 1, Lines 15-55 of Yamane teach a controller configured to control the first PLL block to operate before a minimum time period required for the first PLL block to lock up from the start point of a transmission burst period, to control the second PLL block to operate before a minimum time period required for the second PLL block to lock up from the start point of a reception burst period, to control the radio transmitter portion to operate only during a transmission burst period and to control the radio reception portion to operate only during a reception burst period. However, upon reviewing the cited passages and figures, a reference to the recitations of a controller configured to control the first PLL block to operate before a minimum time period required for the first PLL block to lock up from the start point of a transmission burst period, to control the second PLL block to operate before a minimum time period required for the second PLL block to lock up from the start point of a reception burst period, to control the radio transmitter portion to operate only during a transmission burst period and to control the radio reception portion to operate only during a reception burst period, as recited in the Claim 1 of the present application, could not be found in Yamane.

Yamane specifically teaches controller 11 generates the transmission timing signal St and the reception timing signal Sr a predetermined time Tr (FIG. 12) after the detection of the sync signal and further teaches when a predetermined time Ta has expired, the autonomous generation of the transmission timing signal St is stopped (and hence the transmission is halted) (e.g., see Column 10, Lines 54-58 and the paragraph beginning at Column 10, line 66). In other words, by generating the transmission timing signal St and the reception timing signal Sr , Yamane teaches reception and transmission can occur at the same time.

In contrast to that which is taught by Yamane, Claim 1 includes the recitation of a controller configured to control the first PLL block to operate before a minimum time period required for the first PLL block to lock up from the start point of a transmission burst period, to control the second PLL block to operate before a minimum time period required for the second PLL block to lock up from the start point of a reception burst period, to control the radio transmitter portion to operate only during a transmission burst period and to control the radio reception portion to operate only during a reception burst period, which is neither taught nor suggested by Yamane. Accordingly, as Yamane does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of Claim 1, it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Yamane be withdrawn.

Regarding the Examiner's rejection of independent Claim 1 as being anticipated by Kosiec; after reviewing the cited reference, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is incorrect. Kosiec teaches opening a phase locked loop (PLL) for a predetermined period of time when a transient condition is encountered to reduce the length of time it takes for the PLL to correct for phase and frequency error generated by the transient condition (Column 4, Lines 38-50; and Column 6, Lines 59-63). The transient condition is shown occurring at time t1 of the timing diagram shown in FIG. 5 of Kosiec. Kosiec defines the transient condition as a load impedance change at a voltage controlled oscillator (VCO) or a change in the loop bandwidth (Column 5, lines 34-36).

In contrast to that which is taught by Kosiec, Claim 1 includes the recitation of a controller configured to control the first PLL block to operate before a minimum time period required for the first PLL block to lock up from the start point of a transmission burst period, to control the second PLL block to operate before a minimum time period required for the second PLL block to lock up from the start point of a reception burst period, to control the radio transmitter portion to operate only during a transmission burst period and to control the radio reception portion to operate only during a reception burst period, which is neither taught nor suggested by Kosiec. Accordingly, as Kosiec does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of Claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kosiec be withdrawn.

Regarding the Examiner's rejection of independent Claim 2, this claim includes similar recitations as those contained in Claim 1. Additionally, Claim 2 includes the recitation of a controller for controlling the first PLL block to operate before an end point of a reception burst period, for controlling the second PLL block to operate before an end point of a transmission burst period, for controlling the radio transmitter portion to operate only during a transmission burst period and for controlling the radio reception portion to operate only during a reception burst period, which is neither taught nor suggested by Yamane or Kosiec. Accordingly, as the cited references do not teach or suggest each and every limitation of Claim 2, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) of Claim 2 be withdrawn for at least the above-stated reasons.

Regarding the Examiner's rejection of independent Claim 3, this claim includes similar

recitations as those contained in Claim 1. Additionally, Claim 3 includes the recitation of controlling the first PLL block to operate before a minimum time period required for the first PLL block to lock up from the start point of a transmission burst period, controlling a radio transmitter portion to operate only during a transmission burst period, controlling the second PLL block to operate before a minimum time period required for the second PLL block to lock up from the start point of a reception burst period, and controlling a radio reception portion to operate only during a reception burst period, which is neither taught nor suggested by Yamane or Kosiec. Accordingly, as the cited references do not teach or suggest each and every limitation of Claim 3, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) of Claim 3 be withdrawn for at least the above-stated reasons.


Regarding the Examiner's rejection of independent Claim 5, this claim includes similar recitations as those contained in Claim 1. Additionally, Claim 5 includes the recitation of controlling the first PLL block to operate before the end point of a reception burst period, controlling a radio transmitter portion to operate only during a transmission burst period, controlling the second PLL block to operate before the end point of a transmission burst period, and controlling a radio reception portion to operate only during a reception burst period, which is neither taught nor suggested by Yamane or Kosiec. Accordingly, as the cited references do not teach or suggest each and every limitation of Claim 5, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) of Claim 5 be withdrawn for at least the above-stated reasons.

Independent Claims 1-3 and 5 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Without

conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 4 and 6, these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on their respective independent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of dependent Claims 4 and 6 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-6, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant(s)

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-8484
Fax: (516) 228-8516
PJF/VAG/ml